

to determine which loan program meets the needs of students, institutions, and taxpayers, we need a thorough evaluation of both programs and the bill we are introducing today allows for such an evaluation.

The bill allows for a much larger pilot than was contemplated under the 1992 amendments to the Higher Education Act, but we believe that a pilot consisting of 40 percent of new loan volume will permit Congress to carefully oversee and evaluate its implementation. At the same time, we will be maintaining a stable Federal Family Education Loan Program for those institutions not wishing to participate in a Government direct lending program. When both programs are fully operational, Congress will be able to fairly evaluate the programs for efficiency and cost effectiveness prior to making decisions to totally replace one program with the other.

Specifically, this bill provides for the continued implementation of the direct loan program at those institutions selected for participation in order to achieve 40 percent of new loan volume. It calls for increased congressional oversight with respect to the expenditure of funds on the part of the Department of Education and a revision to budget scoring rules that will correct the existing bias in favor of direct lending programs described by Rudolph Penner, former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, in his testimony before the Budget Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate on January 10, 1995. We have attempted to ease the application process for all students participating in the student aid programs to ensure that all students are treated in the same manner. Most importantly, we have provided stability to the student loan programs which are vital to the continued access to higher education for the students of this country.

In my new role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning, I look forward to working with Chairman GOODLING and all the members of the subcommittee and full committee as we work to reform and improve the education and workplace policy programs under our jurisdiction.

CLINTON WRONG ON EIGHTIES

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable in some quarters, including the White House, to dismiss the 1980's as a time of greed and venality, in which the rich exploited the poor and the Federal Government's deficits went wild due to the economic policies of the Reagan administration.

In today's edition of my hometown paper, the Contra Costa Times we read a lucid, compelling refutation of the President's misguided perspective. As the editorial in the Times notes, the eighties were a time of unprecedented economic growth. New jobs, rising wages and lower inflation followed the Reagan program. Yes, deficits grew—because a Congress without fiscal discipline spent without restraint.

I am including this outstanding editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it is a

needed corrective to the relentless stream of misinformation we hear all too often about the Reagan era. I hope that many of my colleagues will take the time to read it.

CLINTON WRONG ON 1980'S—PRESIDENT SHOULD FOCUS ON PROBLEMS OF 1990'S

President Bill Clinton made a major mistake when he claimed that Republicans had disavowed Reaganomics and that Congress made a mistake in 1981 "to adopt a bidding war in the tax cuts that gave us what became known as 'trickle-down economics' and quadrupled the national debt."

Republican leaders were quick to point out that they never attacked Reagan's policies and that Clinton was dead wrong about the cause of the deficit.

The president's remarks are hardly a way to begin a bipartisan effort to control federal spending and bring about needed reforms in government programs.

Equally disturbing is the view Clinton and many others in positions of power have of the 1980s.

Reagan's tax policies, which received wide bipartisan support at the time, can hardly be blamed for mounting deficits. Even though tax rates were reduced, government revenues grew dramatically, nearly doubling in the 1980s.

As a percentage of gross domestic product, tax revenues remained nearly constant. What grew during the 1980s was government spending.

Clinton also was wrong in saying that under Reagan the poor got poorer while the rich got richer. That's only half true. Wealthy people indeed gained economically in the 1980s, but so did the poor and middle classes.

According to the Department of Commerce, even the poorest one-fifth of Americans gained income in inflation-adjusted dollars in the 1980s, as did every other major income grouping.

More than 19 million jobs were created in the 1980s, unemployment dropped by one-fourth, inflation dropped by two-thirds, and the country enjoyed a prolonged economic expansion. That's a record Republicans are not about to back away from.

It's time for Clinton to stop campaigning against the 1980s and work together with the GOP to correct the problems of the 1990s.

END CHILDHOOD HUNGER—NOT NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that welfare needs to be reformed—but we should not throw the baby out with the bath water. The Personal Responsibility Act contains a proposal to block grant current Federal nutrition programs such as WIC, Food Stamps, and the School Breakfast and Lunch Programs. It would remove their entitlement status. It would reduce their funding levels. This would be a terrible mistake.

Block granting these programs would in all likelihood increase hunger amongst our Nation's children. States will now have to bear the burden of administering the programs with less funding. States will be forced to make extremely difficult choices like reducing funding for WIC or eliminating the School Breakfast Programs because they are short of funds.

I believe it is part of the Federal Government's job to set priorities for our Nation and

for me, our children are the priority. We can't, in good conscience, be unmoved when children go to bed hungry at night. We can't just send the issue of childhood hunger to the States and hope the problem goes away.

These food assistance programs serve as an important safety net for children. The Food Stamp Program alone serves 10 percent of the population in America—half of which are children. We know that for every dollar spent on WIC, we save \$5 in health care costs later on down the road. We know that every child who participates in the School Breakfast Program is better able to learn in school and thus is more prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

It is time to end childhood hunger, not successful nutrition programs that feed hungry children.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT LOAN EVALUATION AND STABILIZATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with several of my distinguished colleagues in the introduction of the Student Loan Evaluation and Stabilization Act—legislation that will allow a systematic review and evaluation of the current student loan programs. Specifically, this legislation will allow for the careful evaluation and comparison of the Federal Family Education Loan Program and the Federal Direct Student Loan Program to a true pilot status and allowing both programs to operate with continued stability for several years. Once this is accomplished, an independent evaluation can be made about whether the direct loan program serves students and institutions effectively, and whether the Federal Government can manage—and pay for—the multibillion-dollar student loan program which is so important to assuring access to higher education for millions of Americans.

Through the reconciliation process, the 103d Congress made policy considerations and decisions affecting the student loan programs without the benefit of a true evaluation of the long-term cost and effect. The impetus for the move to establish a direct Government lending program was projected budgetary savings of \$4.3 billion over 5 years. When pressed, however, the Congressional Budget Office revealed that when the administrative costs associated with a direct determination, almost one-half of the savings disappear. Rudolph Penner, former Director of the Congressional Budget Office in testimony before the Budget Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate on January 10, 1995, identified this particular aspect of scoring a direct Government lending program as one of the arbitrary measures currently found in the Credit Reform Act which creates a strong bias in favor of using direct loans instead of guarantees.

While the Clinton administration was talking about promoting new public/private sector partnerships, they moved forward with their

proposal to dismantle one of the most successful of such partnerships. Participation of the private sector in the student loan program was summarily dismissed as being unnecessary and too costly. Notwithstanding the poor administrative record of the Government in the direct lending business, the belief that direct Government lending would lead to major improvements and lower costs in the student loan program was the overriding theme.

However, with the advent of the new Congress, we have determined that a careful comparison of programs for efficiency and cost effectiveness needs to be undertaken before decisions to totally replace one program with another can be made with any degree of confidence. We believe this to be particularly true when dealing with a loan program projected to be in the magnitude of \$30 billion by 1998.

The legislation we are introducing today is designed to stabilize the current student loan programs, limit the loan volume in the Direct Loan Program to those institutions which have elected to participate in the first 2 years, continue the improvements which have already been initiated, and increase and enhance the congressional oversight of these particular programs. We pledge that the Congress will thoroughly evaluate the quality, effectiveness, efficiency and costs associated with these programs so that Members of this body are able to make informed decisions about what works for students, institutions and American taxpayers.

Specifically, this bill will allow for: First, the continued implementation of the Federal Direct Student Loan Program; second, the continued stability of the Federal Family Education Loan Program; third, reduced expenditures on the part of the Department of Education; fourth, improved Congressional oversight of expenditures; fifth, ease in the application process for all students; and sixth, a revision to the Congressional Budget Act which will provide truth in budget scoring when determining costs associated with a guaranteed loan program and a direct Government lending program. I believe these are all important steps that this Congress needs to take in order to compare and evaluate programs while continuing to support our country's students in the pursuit of their education goals.

I want to express my pleasure at having the opportunity to work with BUCK MCKEON, the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Post-secondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning, as he and the other subcommittee members tackle the important issues facing the 104th Congress in the areas of education and workplace policy.

I also want to express my gratitude to BART GORDON and my other Democratic colleagues who have helped to create this bipartisan effort and who share my concerns about integrity and accountability in the student aid programs. This bipartisan group has steadfastly voiced concerns with respect to this untested, expansive direct Government lending program and its long-term implications.

PRAISE FOR BILL STOUFFER

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, few of us in this body would achieve much success if not for the help of the local officials in the towns and cities of our districts which we represent. These local officials are often the catalysts behind legislation which reaches both the State and Federal levels. Unfortunately, the selfless work of these men and women who serve the public at the local level all too often goes unrecognized. Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to such a local official from my congressional district, who has dedicated his life to serving the community in which he lives. The man I am speaking of is Mr. Bill Stouffer of Altoona, PA.

Bill Stouffer has devoted the majority of his life toward serving and helping the people around him. He graduated from Altoona High School in 1940 and immediately answered the call of his country as a U.S. Marine Corps combat soldier. He has been noted as one of the first Americans to enter Nagasaki after the bomb was dropped. After the war, Bill worked for the city of Altoona as an electrical foreman for 18 years, earning a reputation amongst his peers as a man of integrity and character. This reputation enabled him to seek and win election to the Altoona City Council. He served as a city councilman from 1964-71 and in doing so distinguished himself as a community leader with a vision for a better tomorrow.

In 1972, Bill Stouffer was elected mayor of the city of Altoona. During his tenure as the city's mayor the area reaped the benefits of his leadership. Examples of this benefit can be seen in projects such as the construction of the 10th Avenue Expressway, the 11th Street tower, the water treatment plant, and the expansion of the Penn State Altoona campus. These projects and others like them helped to both create jobs and improve the quality of life for the people of Altoona.

In 1980, Bill Stouffer moved on to serve as a Blair County commissioner. As commissioner I asked him to chair a local committee to help bring the FAA Flight Service Center to the Altoona-Blair County Airport. It came as no surprise to me when Bill went after this task without hesitation, organizing and mobilizing a group of individuals to help make our case to the FAA. Although the Altoona area faced fierce competition from other cities including Pittsburgh, we were able to obtain the flight service center. This accomplishment would not have been possible if not for Bill's tireless work and undying commitment to the project.

Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend and colleague, Bill Stouffer, announced that he would not seek reelection to another term as county commissioner. While I am sad to see him go, I know that Bill's work within the community is far from finished. Bill will move on to become more deeply involved in his already extensive work with his church and other civic activities such as the Salvation Army, the Altoona Kiwanis, and a women's prison ministry which he himself established. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute Bill Stouffer for his more than 30 years of service to the community which he

loves, and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

NEBRASKA CORNHUSKERS ARE FOOTBALL'S NATIONAL CHAMPIONS IN EVERY WAY

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Cornhuskers' thrilling victory in the Orange Bowl on New Year's Day was an exhilarating success for the entire State. This Member joins all Nebraskans in extending hearty congratulations to Coach Tom Osborne and the Nebraska Cornhuskers on being named college football's national champions.

As important as this victory was for Nebraska, this Member believes it also sends an important message to all Americans. Everyone would do well to study the lessons offered by Coach Tom Osborne and the Huskers throughout the 1994 season. The Huskers' perfect season, the exciting Orange Bowl win, and the resulting national championship tell a compelling story about the importance of perseverance, hard work, and commitment to a goal.

The entire Cornhusker team was intensely motivated from the beginning of the year to complete its unfinished business. This incentive enabled the Big Red to rise above numerous obstacles along the way. Many so-called football experts counted the Huskers out when their star quarterback was unable to play and his backup suffered an injury as well. What wasn't taken into consideration was the absolute dedication of the entire team to turn it up a notch to get the job done. This same determination shone brightly when the team was trailing the University of Miami on their home field, in the Orange Bowl, during the fourth quarter. The Huskers pulled together as a team and found a way to completely stymie the Miami team and win.

The Huskers are clearly a reflection of their outstanding coach, Dr. Tom Osborne. During his 22 years as head coach, Osborne has earned national respect and praise for his coaching expertise, integrity, high academic motivation, and genuine concern for his players. He has set exemplary standards for excellence and character both on and off the field. Nebraska and NCAA football are certainly fortunate to have such an exceptional coach and role model.

Nebraskans have always considered Coach Osborne and the Huskers to be champions. It is certainly gratifying to see that the overwhelming majority of the country agrees. In conclusion, this Member commends to his colleagues the following article from the January 3, 1995, edition of the Lincoln Journal congratulating the Nebraska Cornhuskers on their outstanding success. Go Big Red.

[From the Lincoln Journal, Jan. 3, 1995]

HUSKERS: N CREDIBLE!

In the world of sports, as in the rest of the world, the good guys don't always win. In the 22 years since they won their last national title, a succession of very good Nebraska Cornhusker football teams has learned that, no matter how much they train and try, the other guys are sometimes better.